

Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

IBM CORP (YA) C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC P.O. BOX 802333 DALLAS TX 75380

**COPY MAILED** 

JAN 1 1 2007

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of

Brown et al.

Application No. 10/042077

DECISION ON PETITION

Filed: 01/08/2002

Attorney Docket No.

AUS920010687US1

This is a decision on the "PETITION TO WITHDRAW HOLDING OF ABANDONMENT OFFICE ACTION NOT RECEIVED," filed on 16 October, 2006.

The petition is GRANTED.

On 24 March, 2006, the Office mailed a non-final Office action, which set a three-month shortened statutory period for reply. In the apparent absence of a timely filed response, the application was held abandoned on 25 June, 2006. The filing of the present petition precedes the mailing of Notice of Abandonment.

In the petition, applicants asserted that the practitioner did not receive the non-final Office action. Specifically, the practitioner asserts that the Office action was returned to the USPTO as undeliverable.

In the absence of any irregularity in the mailing of the nonfinal Office action, there is a strong presumption that the nonfinal Office action was properly mailed to practitioner at the address of record. This presumption may be overcome by a showing that the final Office action was not in fact received.

showing required to establish the failure to receive an Office communication must include a statement from the practitioner stating that the Office communication was not received by the practitioner and attesting to the fact that a search of the file jacket and docket records indicates that the Office action was not received. A copy of the docket record where the non-received Office action would have been entered had it been received and docketed must be attached to and referenced in practitioner's statement. See "Withdrawing the Holding of Abandonment When Office Actions Are Not Received" 1156 Official Gazette 53 (November 16, 1993) and M.P.E.P. § 711.03(c). The showing outlined above may not be sufficient if there are circumstances that point to a conclusion that the final Office action may have been lost after receipt rather than a conclusion that the final Office action was lost in the mail.

A review of the record indicates that the Office action was properly mailed to the petitioner at the correspondence address of record at the time of mailing. Thus, there was no irregularity in mailing the Office action on the part of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

In support of the petition, the petitioner has submitted a statement by registered practitioner Duke W. Yee attesting to the fact that a search of the file jacket and docket records indicates that the Office action was not received. A copy of petitioner's docket record is supplied with the petition.

A review of the record indicates that the USPTO mailed the non-final Office action to the correct correspondence address; however, it was inexplicably returned to the USPTO on 4 April, 2006. For this reason, the practitioner did not receive the non-final Office action of 24 March, 2006.

The petitioner has made a sufficient showing of nonreceipt of the Office action. Accordingly, the Notice of Abandonment is hereby vacated and the holding of abandonment withdrawn.

As such, the holding of abandonment is withdrawn. The application is restored to pending status.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

The application file is being referred to Technology Center 2600 technical support staff for remailing of the non-final Office action mailed on 24 March, 2006. The period for reply will be reset from the mailing date thereof.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3231. Any other questions regarding the status of the application or the examination process should be directed to the Technology Center.

Douglas I. Wood

Senior Petitions Attorney

Office of Petitions